

Appl. No. 10/523,331
Amdt. Dated June 12, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2007

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim modifications to claim 4 eliminate the basis for the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections. Applicants have modified claim 4 to eliminate the duplicate phrase identified by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants have modified claim 2 to overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, in light of the claim modifications, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now fully comport with requirements of section 112 and accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejection set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicants' present invention is directed to new methods of manufacturing and resultant structures which overcome significant shortcomings and deficiencies of the prior art directed to the formation of device incorporated substrates. In accordance with the present invention, a metal base structure and a dissolvee metal material layer are provided for formation of a patterned metal layer. Subsequently, the structure of an insulating substrate and a patterned metal layer are incorporated together. The dissolvee metal layer and the metal substrate are subsequently removed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references cited by the Examiner provide no teaching or suggest whatsoever regarding this advance in the art. In order to

Appl. No. 10/523,331
Amdt. Dated June 12, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2007

highlight the distinctions between the claims and the prior art, Applicants have modified the independent claim to specify that, the device housing step occurring after the pattern transfer step and before the transfer sheet removal step

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references relied on by the Examiner provides no teaching or suggest whatsoever regarding this advance in the art. Most notably, the admitted prior art upon which the Examiner relies as a basis for rejecting the claims describes a manufacturing technique wherein the individual device structure was applied to the transfer sheet prior to securing the transfer sheet structure to the insulating structure. See, for example, Figure 13 D.

In sharp contrast with the admitted prior art, Applicants presently claimed invention specifies that the semiconductor device is secured only after the transfer sheet has been secured to the insulating material structure. The acknowledged prior art actually teaches away from this approach and describes the direct connection prior to securing the transfer sheet to the insulating substrate. Accordingly, in light of foregoing, Applicants submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

In the event that it is deemed necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Appl. No. 10/523,331
Amdt. Dated June 12, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted

Date:

6/12/08

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
ROCKEY DEPKE, LYONS, LLC
Sears Tower, Suite 5450
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6306
Tel: (312) 277-2006
Attorneys for Applicant